CICE Hiroshima University, *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, Vol.22-2/23-2 (2020) pp.107 ～ 130

A Critically Informed Teacher Education Curriculum in Global Citizenship Education: Training Teachers as Field Experts and Contributors to Assessment and Monitoring of Goals[1]

Susan Wiksten
University of California Los Angeles

Abstract

A global market of education development has grown since the 1990s. As the circumstances and contexts of education change globally, there is both a need for shared references in teacher education as well as good reasons for contesting unitary efforts to implement policy goals. Specifically, shared global references for teacher education that can be used by teacher education programs, NGOs and civil society for responding to target 4c. of SDG 4.7 are needed. Accordingly, this article proposes guiding principles and outlines a teacher education curriculum for Global Citizenship Education (GCED) that can be adapted to low-income country contexts as well as high-income contexts. Some of the challenges, possibilities and limitations in the preparation of teachers with the skills needed for supporting the development of the next generation of global citizens are described. The analysis presented draws on data from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the OECD teacher survey, indicators developed by the World Bank, and policy efforts to develop a definition of global competence, among other sources. The concluding discussion proposes that an important possibility presents itself in efforts to involve teachers in the monitoring and evaluation of education development goals.

[1] Acknowledgement: The paper draws in part on research conducted during a two-month consultancy in 2019 for the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL).

Introduction

The need for international efforts to support the training of qualified teachers, notably in low income economies, is identified in the current UNESCO goals for sustainable development (UNESCO, 2015, p.21, target 4c). To assist in efforts to achieve target 4c, this article proposes a teacher education curriculum for Global Citizenship Education (GCED). The context and rationale for the proposed teacher education curriculum are outlined, first, by describing how a changing field of education development has affected teacher education. Changes over the past thirty years have accorded an increasingly important role to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society in teacher education. This is one of the reasons why efforts to develop shared references such as the proposed curriculum are needed. Second, recent efforts to develop indicators for measuring GCED in terms of *global competence* are identified as insufficient due to a weak recognition of the fact that GCED instruction needs to address in an explicit manner questions that pertain to values, diversity, power and resources. The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018 data on teacher attitudes indicate that many teachers are responsive to these themes and how these equity related themes manifest in their local contexts; the potential of teachers to contribute to the monitoring of development goals in local contexts should be recognized more clearly also in teacher education policies and education development efforts.

The training of teachers as field experts capable of contributing to the assessment and monitoring of education development goals is proposed as a necessary component of education development efforts; notably in order to improve the relevance of education to local contexts. The proposed GCED teacher education curriculum is, albeit limited, an effort to attend to global needs by providing shared reference points and guiding principles for a locally and culturally relevant GCED teacher education curriculum; while recognizing that the finer details of GCED teacher education need to be defined in collaboration with practitioners with experience in teacher education in specific local contexts.

This article is structured as follows. First, the global context of teacher education is discussed by describing how the field of education development actors has changed in the past thirty years, what the GCED agenda is, and some of the challenges to equity GCED teacher education are highlighted by global data on education, teachers and key indicators (OECD, 2019b; UIS, 2020a, 2020b; World Bank, 2019b, 2020). The policy efforts to establish *global competence* as an indicator of GCED are subsequently commented on because such an OECD indicator de facto functions as a political guideline for GCED teacher education curricula in a context where other globally shared references for GCED teacher education are missing. Components for a global GCED teacher education curriculum are proposed. The final discussion notes that teacher education can contribute in important ways to strengthening a systemic capacity for quality assurance of development goals (such as SDG 4.7, 4c) by enabling teachers to become field experts

and contributors to the assessment and monitoring of education development goals. The development of shared references and guidelines that can be used also by NGOs and civil society—such as the GCED teacher education curriculum in this article—is an important support to this end.

The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations in Education Development

The relationship of the United Nations (UN), national agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) has changed over the past century. After the Second World War, investments in the development of institutions, United Nations agencies and national agencies represented two urgent needs. One was the post-war reconstruction of societies; the second was capacity-building in the form of national agencies that were to support the development of education. Institutions that have supported the development of international policy articulations and monitoring of progress through the collection of education data are a legacy of this post-war period; these include the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

An important shift in global geopolitics and, as a consequence, the role of the United Nations became evident by the 1990s. Many countries underwent governance shifts in the 1980s and 1990s adopting liberal policies and opening markets to global trade and finance. This coincided with technological developments that made an increasing amount of global connections possible. The multi-dimensional globalization that followed altered the circumstances in which education takes place (Appadurai, 1990). A global market of education provision and development emerged, or as Dale termed it: a "knowledge economy" (Dale, 2005).

Education shifted from having been primarily the domain of national agencies to a global commodity that needed to respond to consumer demands (Dale, 2005, p. 118). The very terminology by which governing was referred to in English changed. Governing was prior to the 1980s the business of governments. With the implementation of a neo-liberal agenda it became the business of outsourced consultants, experts, private sector entities and civic associations, i.e., the domain of non-governmental-organizations (NGOs). Hence, the *governing* of education development by national organizations bound by the legal framework of a nation-state shifted to the *governance* of education development by a broader set of actors that included civic associations from other countries and international private enterprises based in various countries.

These developments manifested in the operational and formal relationships between the United Nations, national agencies and NGOs in the 1995 UN Directives concerning relations with NGOs (UNESCO, 1995, pp. 77–90). The directive established that NGOs could have either formal (associate or consultant) or operational relationships with the UN, i.e., either participate in the articulation of policies or ad hoc project implementation.

The change in the relationship between the UN and NGOs shifted much of the planning and implementation of development efforts and interventions—in line with a new public management logic—from national and UN agencies to NGOs. The shift was not driven by the UN but reflects the UNESCO's response to a shift in policies among member states. A shift that represented the neoliberal policy agenda promoted by the Reagan and Thatcher governments in the United States and the United Kingdom in the 1980s; an agenda that subsequently was taken up in adapted forms in countries across the globe.

How Shifts in Development Agenda Have Impacted Teacher Education

The above developments impacted teacher education. Whereas teacher education until the 1980s and 1990s was governed by national public curricula, interventions by private enterprises such as the Gates foundation (Welner, 2017), the Agha Khan Academies (Walji, 2020) and NGOs such as Teach for America (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005)—to name just a few—have since proliferated and provide training alternatives for those wishing to work as teachers. Following a model of flexible governance of multiple actors in a market of teacher education providers, countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States have long standing traditions in which professional associations and bodies play an important role in the certification of teachers. Teacher certification has been one way to ensure quality of teacher education in liberal markets.

Other historical models have included the placement of teacher education programs at research universities, where the responsibility for quality has rested on teacher education programs and the scientific community at universities. The latter is the case, for example, in Finland and Japan (Wiksten, 2018; Wiksten & Green, 2020; Nuffic, 2015). Teacher education programs for which research faculty at research universities contribute to quality assurance have historically been common in the United States as well. However, the provision of teacher education in the United States has diversified since policy changes in the 1980s and includes today in addition to universities also NGOs such as Teach for America.

The shift from *governing* to *governance* has in teacher education corresponded with an outsourcing of teacher preparation from universities to NGOs, civil society and private enterprises. Shortages in the number of qualified teachers resulted in part from the adoption of a neo-liberal agenda as public education budgets were cut. Shortages in qualified teachers are directly associated with increases in the number of unqualified teachers. This is a need to which NGOs such as Teach for America have responded to.

The proliferation of a global market of education and the preparation of teachers can be understood to have four effects. One is a form of democratization and internationalization in the sense that the range of actors who participate in teacher education and the development of education has increased since the 1980s and 1990s. The second is internationalization in that teacher education is no longer the field of only national actors. IEA studies and the OECD Programme for International Student

Assessment (PISA) study contribute further to internationalization by framing an international competition in education by student scores (Mullis et al., 2016; OECD, 2016a). The third effect is a loss of political representation. NGOs may well represent political pressure groups in society or internationally, but do not emerge from the context nor operate solely under constraints of local laws, regulations and elected representation in the same way as local organizations do. The latter undermines, from a local perspective, the political legitimacy of NGOs in the development of education. The fourth effect of the growth of a global teacher education market is a loss of confidence in the quality of teachers. As the range of teacher education providers and teacher preparation programs have increased, also the need for quality assurance, teacher evaluation and monitoring of teacher performance have increased.

The Global Citizenship Education Agenda

The Global Citizenship Education (GCED) agenda of the UNESCO is an effort to support a continued development of education internationally through the articulation of shared references within the broader policy agenda of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4.7). Notably, by supporting the development of cognitive learning, socio-emotional learning and behavioural learning (UNESCO, 2020). The current GCED agenda builds on the very first articulations for an international policy on education by UNESCO in 1948 (United Nations, 1948). Namely, the idea that governments of all countries should support all children to participate in education, notwithstanding socio-economic-status, ethnic, linguistic or other exclusion by social group or social category. The idea that education no longer was a purely national interest was seeded in the establishment of UNESCO and in these early articulations for an international policy for education; which was in the 1940s, and which remains in the GCED agenda, an effort to support the promotion of peace and human rights.

The growth of the role of NGOs calls for greater flexibility than traditional teacher education programs. Whereas governments remain key actors in articulating education policies that frame teacher education, there is increasingly a need for teacher education resources for a broader field of actors that include notably the NGOs. The GCED teacher education curricula proposed in this article is intended as one such resource and has been designed with both traditional teacher education providers and NGOs in mind.

Data on Global Challenges for GCED Teacher Education

Challenges to GCED teacher education are context specific; however, the ‘big picture’ of challenges for GCED teacher education coincides with overall challenges to the development of education globally. A basic indicator for the availability of qualified candidates for teacher education in a given context is the secondary completion rate

(ISCED 3).[2] Secondary completion rates coincide with country income rankings. The average of secondary completion rates in high-income countries globally is 80% (UNESCO, 2019; OECD, 2019a). Completion rates in low-income countries are on average close to 20%, whereas in lower-middle-income countries the average is over 40% (UNESCO, 2019).

Comparatively more young men than young women complete upper secondary education in low-income and lower-middle-income countries (UNESCO, 2019). Upper secondary completion rates higher than 50% coincide across world regions with comparatively higher numbers of young women completing upper secondary education (ibid.). A comparatively greater number of young women complete secondary education in Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and North America as well as Eastern and South-Eastern Asia (UNESCO, 2019). In brief, the success of young women in upper secondary education is more at risk in low-income countries whereas disadvantaged young men are comparatively at greater risk in high-income countries.

Reasons for the observed differences include factors before, during and after participation in secondary education. High income countries have reached close to universal access to primary education (ISCED 1), which is a prerequisite for participation in secondary programs (ISCED 2 -3). Low drop-out rates in secondary education are another possible explanation. An important feature associated with wide access to secondary education is also the availability of formally recognized adult learning and education programs that allow students to participate in secondary education at a later stage in life. The latter adds flexibility of participation in important ways in particular for historically disadvantaged groups; notably, when supported by education policies together with labour market policies that help to normalize and de-stigmatise alternative pathways in education (Desjardins, 2017; Green et al., 2009; Esping-Andersen, 1990). The normalization of alternative pathways benefits overall equity goals of education systems. The reason for this is that lower socio-economic status groups and historically marginalized groups in societies are disproportionately represented among students who do not complete secondary education (Brey et al., 2019, p. 97; OECD, 2018a, p. 188).

The above circumstances pose challenges to GCED teacher education in terms of the diversity and availability of candidates for taking on roles as GCED teachers. Adult education alternatives in order to increase the flexibility of GCED teacher education are for this reason proposed an important complement to formal and traditional teacher education settings. Particular attention in low income countries should be given to supporting the participation of young women in GCED teacher education programs; whereas in high-income countries, in turn, particular attention should be given to supporting the participation of disadvantaged young men in GCED teacher education programs. As suggested in the teacher education curriculum detailed in section four of this article, GCED teacher education programs should be designed to cater to diverse

[2] International Standard Classification of Education UIS, 2012

participants in order to support the representation of diversity among students.

Globally, the UN's human rights agenda (United Nations, 1948) as well as contemporary value frameworks that align with postcolonial, postmodern and post-structural stances (Abdi, 2015; Andreotti and Souza, 2012; Barrett, M., 2016; Sant et al., 2018) propose that equitable participation and representation of societal groups in education is important. Similarly, data from the TALIS confirms a global expectation across education systems—in low income countries as well as high income countries—that teachers as professionals contribute to mitigating societal inequities (UIS, 2020a; OECD, 2019b). The latter is reflected in teacher motivations to join the teaching force as documented in TALIS survey data from 2018 (OECD, 2019b; Table 1).

Table 1. Motivation for entering teaching force in relation to benefitting the socially disadvantaged. Teacher responses to "How important were the following for you to become a teacher?"

Teaching allowed me to benefit the socially disadvantaged (TT3G07F)					
Education system	Of low or no importance at all	Of high or moderate importance	Total number of respondents	Gini	Human Capital Index
Denmark	32%	68%	2547	28	77%
Japan	32%	68%	3292	32	84%
Turkey	8%	92%	3166	42	63%
United States	16%	84%	2525	42	76%

Source: Table constructed by author using data retrieved 08/2019 from the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) at http://www.oecd.org/education/talis/. Gini and Human Capital Index estimates retrieved 08/2019 from https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/human-capital (World Bank, 2019b).

Table 1 presents a cross-tabulation of Gini, Human Capital Index and motivation to benefit the socially disadvantaged as reported by more than 2500 teachers in Denmark, Japan, Turkey and the United States. This comparison demonstrates that 96% of US teachers reported that the idea that they would contribute to society mattered for their decision to join the teaching force (OECD, 2019b). For 84% of US teachers, the idea that they would benefit the socially disadvantaged was of importance for joining the teaching force. Similarly, 98% of teachers in Turkey reported being motivated by the idea that they would contribute to society and 92% by benefitting the socially disadvantaged. Both of these percentages are much lower for Japan (81% society and 68% disadvantaged). Teachers in Denmark responded by numbers that were similar and even lower compared to teachers in Japan (77% society and 68% disadvantaged) (Table 1; OECD, 2019b).

In practice, these data demonstrate that the comparative frequency of teacher motivation to contribute to society and to benefit the socially disadvantaged coincides in high-income countries with comparatively higher inequality in income distribution,

as measured by Gini estimates (OECD, 2019b; World Bank, 2019a). A higher Human Capital Index ranking (Denmark, Japan) coincides in this comparison with lower overall disparities in income distribution and fewer teachers reporting motivations to join the teaching force in order to contribute to society and to benefit the socially disadvantaged (Table 1; OECD, 2019b). These data indicate that teachers are responsive to societal inequities and that teacher motivation to work for equity is influenced in part by what teachers perceive as pressing societal needs. This observation reflects, on the one hand, the proximity of teachers to local contexts in their role as practitioners.

The data also indicates that teachers working in contexts that are characterized by greater economic inequality are under comparatively greater pressure to articulate a professional role that focuses on addressing societal inequities. Due to the political nature of decisions that are needed in societies for addressing macro-level inequities it is proposed that the expectation that teachers mitigate societal inequities is to some extent unrealistic and places an unreasonable burden on teachers, thereby promoting teacher burn-out. It is for this reason important that GCED teacher education curricula address power and resource issues so that GCED teachers develop skills to reflect on their societal role and the expectations placed on teachers, and for developing skills for modelling self-reflection in terms of power and resource issues in their teaching. Supporting teacher self-reflection in this vein is a common practice in many teacher education programs internationally and has been promoted, e.g., by teacher educators in Finland as a means to build professional integrity and confidence among teachers (Wiksten, 2018, p.100).

Global Competence

Current international efforts to articulate principles for GCED teacher education consist primarily of policy articulations that do not perhaps in a very direct manner impact practices in individual education systems. The strongest international influence on curricula in the current context is set by international OECD surveys, in particular the PISA study (see e.g. Kim, 2020; Kirwan, 2015; Nakayasu, 2016). The OECD's effort to create a global competence measure for the 2018 PISA survey proposes thereby guiding principles for a GCED teacher education curriculum in terms of expectations to the kinds of results GCED teachers are expected to achieve. PISA is a tri-annual survey of student skills at the age of 15 in high-income countries that participate in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2016b). The 2018 PISA survey included a new measure of *global competence* promoted by the OECD as a set of knowledge, skills and values necessary for harmonious co-existence in multicultural communities (OECD, 2018b, p.4)

> *Global competence is the capacity to examine local, global and intercultural issues, to understand and appreciate the perspectives and world views of others, to engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions with people from different cultures, and to act for collective well-being and sustainable*

development. (OECD, 2018b, p. 7)

The above definition was preceded by a similarly articulated Council of Europe description of desired competences for democratic culture (Barrett, 2016). The *intercultural competence* definition on which the above definition seems to build underscores the idea that intercultural dialogue is " […] of central importance to democratic processes within culturally diverse societies" (Barrett, 2016, p. 15). The term *intercultural* was in antecedent policy efforts by the Council of Europe referred to as diversity within societies, between societies and in a global context (Council of Europe, 2008, pp. 10–11). An impetus for developing these new articulations has been the perception that there was a need to move away from older "assimilationist" and "multiculturalist" approaches to the management of cultural diversity in societies with unprecedented and ever-growing diversity (Council of Europe, 2008, p. 9). These efforts can be understood as a formalization of postmodern value frameworks in the Council of Europe policy process, where new impetus has been given to respond to the needs of increasingly diverse populations and to the recognition of diversity as something societies politically need to govern rather than reject (see also Crenshaw, 1989).

The stance taken in this article is that the OECD's definition of global competence is not sufficiently responsive to context specific differences and that it therefore inadvertently risks promoting approaches that are not sensitive to diversity in GCED teacher education. The GCED teacher education curriculum proposed in the following section of this article complements and elaborates on the OECD definition with important critical insights in order to improve relevancy. Many scholars, notably those who draw on postmodern and post-structuralist value frameworks, underscore the importance of recognizing diversity (age, race, gender, first-language, ethnicity, ability group) in education (see e.g. Andreotti & Souza, 2012; Misiaszek, 2015; Torres, 2009; Bajaj & Bartlett, 2017; Sant et al., 2018; Howard & Navarro, 2016). In contrast, some of the proponents for the measuring of global competence represent more conventional modern and assimilationist frameworks that do not emphasize the need to address diversity in education (e.g., Boix Mansilla, V. & Chua, F., 2016). The latter explains in part why a number of OECD countries have rejected the use of the global competence measure proposed by the OECD as insufficient or not relevant (Fiore & Poliandri, 2020).

Components for a Teacher Education Curriculum in Global Citizenship Education

The proposed curriculum framework for training educators and teachers in Global Citizenship Education (GCED) draws on prior international efforts to develop shared references for teacher education (Lokhoff et al., 2010; Drudy et al., 2009; Gentles et al., 2016) and global competences (OECD, 2018b; Barrett, 2016; ODIHR, 2012). The curriculum incorporates critical insights from comparative and international education (Stromquist, 2015; Misiaszek, 2015; Torres, 2009; Sant et al., 2018; Wiksten, 2018). The latter contributes an important complement to the curriculum notably by addressing the

political and value-based dimensions of education.[3]

The positive development of student capabilities and cognitive skills depends on the recognition of social positionality (Sen, 2006; Stromquist, 2006). This is why the proposed curriculum explicitly addresses power-resource issues, social categories, social norms, values and ethical frameworks. The latter topics have been identified as necessary curricular topics in comparative education scholarship and by teacher education experts and sustainable development experts (Arnove et al., 2013; Drudy et al., 2009, p. 45; Diemer & Marquat, 2014, p. 17–18; Bruno-Jofre & Johnston, 2014; Gentles et al., 2016). The following are the proposed guidelines for a curriculum.

Principles Promoted by The Curriculum

The proposed curriculum aims at responding to student needs in terms of GCED and sustainable development education. This means in practice that the curriculum deploys the overall UN framework of peace and sustainability promotion in a manner that is relevant to local issues. In order for the curriculum to motivate and engage diverse groups of students, individual program adaptations need to engage issues that are relevant and meaningful for each student group. The curriculum is, for this reason, flexible and relies on GCED teacher instructors to adjust teaching and learning activities to correspond to the needs of diverse groups of students.

Three basic principles of the curriculum are: (1) To prepare teachers, educators and facilitators with competence to respond to student GCED learning needs in locally meaningful ways. This requires the development of teacher, educator and facilitator abilities to respond to student needs in terms of subject matter content, ability to reason about and reflect on pedagogical decisions, and ability to adjust teaching-learning activities to the needs of diverse groups of students (in terms of social, emotional, cultural, cognitive development specific, age specific and faith associated needs); (2) to work with existing resources; (3) to provide youth and adults opportunities to engage, ask questions and be heard.

The curriculum underscores that GCED educators need to know about: education theories; GCED content specific knowledge; models for facilitating student discussions; models for student evaluation and assessment; varieties of values and ethical frameworks; and different practical approaches to teaching and learning. GCED educators also need experience with planning, organizing and communicating. Generic and subject specific

[3] The curriculum is articulated in a flexible manner in order to accommodate local adaptation both for future teachers, teacher students and others, this is done in order to recognize and accommodate shared references that are relevant across the spectrum of lifelong learning and education. In brief, these guidelines are intended for teacher education programs and future teachers but can also serve as guidelines for instruction by those who have not yet obtained formal teacher qualifications; recognizing also that education as a discipline does not prepare only teachers. Studies in education can serve a good knowledge background also for community leaders, NGOs, for those working with the planning of education or in other roles.

competences are detailed in the form of a diagram in Appendix 1.

The GCED teacher education curriculum introduces students to sociological concepts such as norms, social, categories, positionality, intersectionality, equity and equality. The curriculum problematizes social norms, power and resource questions in structured and explicit ways, leaving room also for student discussions and student efforts to articulate questions that students perceive as relevant in terms of positionality, intersectionality, influence in local societies and how local issues relate to regional and global issues.

Only existing resources should be necessary for program completion; GCED educators need to be sensitive to, and strive to, avoiding unnecessary economic burdens on participating students (in the form of study materials, technology requirements, or by other means).

Desired characteristics of participants in GCED teacher education include persons with communication skills, empathy, analytical skills, ability to learn and ability to assume responsibility for tasks. Self-motivated participation in GCED teacher or facilitator programs is preferred and can be supported by organizing GCED educator programs as elective specializations or components of teacher education. GCED teacher education is in the proposed curriculum in a broad and flexible sense for adaptation to local needs and is for this reason proposed within a lifelong learning as suitable both for younger and older learners as a program or program component for existing teacher education programs, adult learning alternatives or as a course for youth in secondary education (ISCED 2 -3).
Competences acquired by participants:

(1) Ability to articulate and communicate the purpose and goals of GCED teaching and learning activities clearly and effectively to diverse groups of students.
(2) Ability to respond to student learning needs (linguistic, physical, cognitive development related, social, emotional, cultural and faith related).
(3) Ability to adjust GCED curricula and teaching-learning materials for local context, to plan lessons, to evaluate students, to reflect on pedagogical choices and to develop a teaching portfolio.
(4) Ability to work together with other teachers for developing teaching materials, addressing student needs and contributing to the development of a fair, supporting and positive learning environment for all.
(5) Ability to pursue continued learning opportunities of relevance for continued professional development as GCED teachers and educators.

Methods of Instruction and Instructor Profiles

The method of GCED teacher preparation proposed in this curriculum framework is student centred. Teaching-learning activities are structured so that active and autonomous participation of students is encouraged. Teaching-learning activities are structured so that students are provided multiple opportunities to practice articulating their understanding

of locally relevant GCED topics through different media and using different technologies: orally, in written and by creating visual representations. Students are supported to practice the use of a variety of ways to express themselves and develop their understanding of topics, including through inquiry and research, through presentations, through group work and individual assignments as well as through discussions in smaller and larger groups.

Methods of training aim at using a variety of teaching-learning practices, in order to model a variety of teaching-learning practices that students can use in their practice as GCED teachers. The variety of models provided can consist of a combination of lectures, group discussions, presentations, assignments, opportunities to practice and carry out instruction as well as opportunities to provide and receive peer feedback. The program can be structured with regularly occurring low-stakes or informal discussions in small groups (3-5 students). An important function of small group discussions is to lower the threshold of social perceptions pertaining to who may speak in class and to accustom and encourage students to express their perspective and understanding. The proposed curriculum includes a review of key concepts, histories and different approaches to GCED instruction as well as a review of theoretical and ethical frameworks for GCED instruction.

Instructors in GCED teacher preparation programs or courses should meet locally defined requirements in the jurisdiction where the GCED teacher preparation program will be offered. Where appropriate, instructors in GCED teacher education programs can be holders of a graduate degree in education (ISCED 7) or hold a postgraduate certificate in education. Instructors need to have knowledge of education theories and practices, and be familiar with the community life of participants and the communities in which GCED teacher students will work. The instructor should be fluent in the first language of participants.

Key competences for instructors are notably the ability to communicate clearly and coherently about learning goals and the purpose of the program. Important are also skills in responding to student needs (social, emotional, cognitive development related, cultural etc.) An example of responsive presence and ability to respond to students' needs is demonstrated, for example, by the instructor's ability to adjust communication style in order to meet learning needs of participants. Openness and respect to cultural otherness and to other beliefs, world views and practices is a key competence of instructors in GCED teacher training. Instructors also need to have competences in presenting information in a variety of ways (orally, visually and through interaction with participants). Instructors need to be competent in planning, time management and in structuring teaching-learning activities; also, in using a variety of information sources. Instructors need to have skills in collective inquiry and be able to step aside in order to allow room for participant contributions. Instructors need to show professional integrity and be competent in applying ethical frameworks to social interaction. Instructors should also be willing to keep up-to-date and continue developing their expertise in GCED and as instructors of GCED teachers.

Locations for the Training

GCED teacher training can be provided at universities or at other locations where teacher preparation is provided. Training can be provided by NGOs or private organizations by qualified personnel to the extent that this is permitted within the regulatory frameworks for the jurisdiction in which teachers are trained and in line with national and regional qualifications frameworks where such exist. The training can be provided as a full-time course over one semester or quarter, or as a specialization consisting of several courses. GCED educator training can be provided at institutions and units that provide adult learning, evening classes and other formally recognized or alternative education programs. The latter would help to meet the need of NGO employees and the general public to gain qualifications and develop knowledge and skills as GCED educators.

Providing GCED teacher students with access to internet allows students to access publicly available documents and develop skills in discerning among sources of information. However, training can be provided in a way that does not require access to internet. Technology for the development of written articulations of student understanding may range from paper and pen to computer access. The level of material resources or infrastructure should not stand in the way of organizing GCED teacher education. It is important that locally relevant teaching and learning materials are used in the program. Whether students have access to a well-equipped library, to textbooks, or whether students are primarily using print-outs compiled by the instructor, materials should help the student to form an understanding of some of the ways that environmental issues and global citizenship issues are meaningful for the local community and the country in which the student lives, and what are some of the connections to broader regional and global issues. The instruction materials accordingly would benefit from including references to, and excerpts from, international agreements, local education policy articulations and concrete examples of the impact of environmental issues and global citizenship issues on local, national, regional and global levels.

Discussion and Conclusion

Responding to the need for international efforts to support the training of qualified teachers—as identified in policy target 4c (UNESCO, 2015, p.21)—calls for the development of shared references and guidelines for a variety of education development actors that include established teacher education programs but also civil society and NGOs. The fact that teacher education has become part of a global education market has multiple consequences that underscore the need for further development of shared international references for teacher education.

The shared references for a GCED teacher education curriculum proposed in this paper draw in part on previous efforts to create shared international references

for curricula such as the TUNING project in Europe in which several universities collaborated in setting shared guidelines for education programs (Drudy et al., 2009; Lokhoff et al., 2010). As the proposed curriculum is not specific to a region or a country[4] it can be compared with international education policy agenda—with the difference that the curriculum is more explicitly oriented to guiding teacher education practices. This is why a discussion on the OECD definition of *global competence* (OECD, 2018b, p. 7) has been included as the definition similarly represents an effort to propose a measurement which—considering the powerful position of the OECD—is perhaps the closest that currently exists in terms of a shared definition for an international guideline for what kinds of skills and knowledges GCED teachers might need to be prepared to foster—thereby inadvertently serving as a curriculum guideline. However, as noted by Fiore and Poliandri (2020), this recent OECD definition has received a vote of dissent from OECD countries that do not agree with the measure.

The curriculum proposed in this article addresses what is here understood as dimensions lacking from the OECD definition of global competence; namely, an explicit recognition of values, diversity and the need for culturally relevant and locally relevant education practices. Specifically, this paper underscores the important role teachers as practitioners can contribute with the assessment of progress towards education development goals, through sensitivity and understanding of specific local contexts that teachers develop as practitioners in the field.

International studies such as the TALIS survey and the PISA survey provide data that can help us to understand how teachers and students fair internationally. However, influential international surveys are not only neutral observations of how students and teachers are doing but are vehicles for proposing policy agenda through the setting of international measurement criteria such as the *global competence* definition by the OECD (2018b, p. 7). Policy definitions by organizations such as the OECD are powerful and highly influential in setting international common-sense definitions for the education policy context in which teacher education takes place, in particular as the global market of education is not controlled by any individual nation state or education system. It is for this reason that the GCED teacher education curriculum in this article has been developed as a response to (1) a need identified by UNESCO and (2) the lacking critical dimensions and sensitivity to the need for culturally and locally relevant articulations of GCED in the OECD PISA articulation of *global competence*. This article proposes that efforts to develop measures for global citizenship or global competence and associated efforts to

[4] Meanwhile, it can be good to note that I have firsthand experience of comparative research primarily of education systems in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Canada, France and the United States—this contributes to my positionality and informs in part my research. As a comparative and international education researcher I continuously seek ways to counter possible biases that are associated with my own social positionality in terms of gender, race, age, nationality and languages (Finnish, Swedish, Danish, French and English). The primary strategy that I use for continuously developing a better judgement in this sense is to collaborate with colleagues from different backgrounds in a variety of research and authorship projects.

prepare teachers who can gauge such measures require complementing the GCED teacher education curriculum with critical insights pertaining to values, social positionality (first language, race, gender, age, etc.), resources and power.

More than access to education is needed following teaching and learning approaches that draw on postmodern value frameworks. The reason for this is that education serves as a site for reproducing inequity in societies. A concrete example is that formal education contributes to the reproduction of gender roles even when girls have gained access to education (Shah, 2015; Stromquist, 2015). Stromquist observes that it is necessary to address social categories and social norms in the curriculum, in order for education to empower historically disadvantaged groups in societies (Stromquist, 2015; Stromquist, 2006). The reason for this is that stereotypes and biases in everyday practices are normalized if not explicitly discussed. In this perspective, it is important that the GCED teacher curriculum introduces GCED teachers to basic social theory that provides conceptual tools, practical examples and models, for how teachers can discuss social categories, social norms, ethical and values frameworks with diverse groups of students.

Flexible study alternatives, for example in the form of formally recognized evening classes or distance learning, are one practical approach by which the participation of disadvantaged populations can be supported. This article suggests that NGOs and civic associations, which already play an important role in the development of education, can play an important role in meeting these global needs. However, in order to meet concerns of quality and equity, it is important that publicly available shared references, resources and guiding documents are used and further developed for guiding the development of teacher education.

With the growth of the influence of private and civic actors in the field of education development a number of possibilities and challenges have emerged. The possible inclusion of a broader range of perspectives and entities specialising in competing in field implementation of policy goals can be understood as a kind of market-based democratization of education development. This can be understood as a positive development in the sense that a more prominent role in education development is accorded to actors trying to figure out pragmatic solutions in the field (Easterly, 2006, pp. 13–15). In this vein, the professionalization of teachers can be developed to support education systems to shift assessment and evaluation of education to teachers. As demonstrated by the TALIS 2018 teacher survey, teachers respond to the context in which they work (Table 1). Teachers are the field operators with immediate access to observing whether interventions seem to work or do not. The curriculum proposed in this article emphasizes, for this reason, the development of self-evaluation skills and the development of competence for pedagogical decision making among teachers as an important part of teacher education and professionalization. An important feature of the proposed GCED curriculum, accordingly, is to support the development of teachers who are empowered to evaluate and adjust teaching practices in collaboration with colleagues, for example, in ways that are promoted in the Japanese lesson study tradition (Elliott, 2019).

As public responsibilities of governing education have shifted to governance practices by civic and private entities and market logic, concerns for quality and equity have been raised (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Rose, 2006). Teacher professionalization can play an important role in addressing both this concern and the above noted concern that NGOs may not represent local interests or perspectives. Teacher certification as a practice has been one way by which liberal education systems have sought to guarantee the quality of teacher education practices in contexts with multiple providers representing both private and public institutions.

This article has sought to respond to the need for the development of shared references and standards that can help to increase and broaden participation by guiding the participation of both established teacher education programs as well as civic associations and NGOs in the preparation of GCED teachers, educators and facilitators. The suggested curriculum is intended as a guideline that needs to be adapted by teacher educators to the local context (Appendix 1).

Whereas postmodern and post-structural value frameworks emphasize the need to incorporate critical perspectives to the development of education and to Global Citizenship Education curricula in explicitly articulated ways, this is not the case for conventional modern curricula that seek to assimilate students and promote conformity. As education in practice depends on dispersed communities of practice, the field of education research by necessity remains somewhat fragmented and a need for varieties of explanations in the field of education remains (compare with Holland & Lave, 2019). Modern stances, as well as tribal and ethnocentric interpretations of policy goals, will continue to remain a part of the broader discourse as local communities, communities of practitioners, and scholarly communities, interpret and make sense of policy goals in terms of SDGs and specific targets such as target 4c. For this reason, it is important to distinguish between the different value frameworks that are drawn upon, because the imposition of modern value frameworks from a central position has historically been associated with ideological education, forms of cultural violence and culturally untenable practices (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1970; hooks, 1994; Hall, 2006; M'Bokolo, 2000).

The proposed curriculum as a support for target 4c as well as the broader GCED and SDG agendas will remain of little relevance unless interpreted meaningfully into specific regional and country contexts in collaboration with teacher educators familiar with respective contexts. Existing teacher education programs as well as NGOs already working with the development of education play an important role in building on these efforts.

References

Abdi, A. A. et al. (Eds.). (2015). *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Andreotti, V., and Souza, L. (Eds.). (2012). *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship*

Education. New York: Routledge.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Theory Culture & Society, 7*, 295–310.

Arnove, R., Torres, C. A. & Franz, S. (2013). *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bajaj, M. & Bartlett, L. (2017). Critical transnational curriculum for immigrant and refugee students. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 25–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2016.1254499

Barrett, M. (2016). *Competences for Democratic Culture: Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*. Council of Europe. https://rm.coe.int/16806ccc07

Boix Mansilla, V. & Chua, F. (2016). Signature Pedagogies in Global Competence Education: Understanding Quality Teaching Practice. In *Educating for the 21st Century: Perspectives, Policies and Practices from Around the World* (pp. 93–115). Springer.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1970). *La réproduction: Éléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*. Les Éditions de Minuit.

Brey, C., Musu, L., McFarland, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2018*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. https://nces.ed.gov/ pubsearch/

Bruno-Jofre, R., & Johnston, J. S. (Eds.). (2014). *Teacher Education in a Transnational World*. University of Toronto Press.

Council of Europe. (2008). *White Paper on intercultural dialogue: "Living together as equals in dignity"*. Committee of Ministers. www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/source/white%20paper_final_revised_en.pdf

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1). https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8

Dale, R. (2005). Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education. *Comparative Education, 41*(2), 117–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060500150906

Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D.J., Gatlin, S. J. & Heilig, J.V. (2005). Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about Teacher Certification, Teach for America, and Teacher Effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(42), 1–48.

Desjardins, R. (2017). *Political Economy of Adult Learning Systems*. Bloomsbury Academic. https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/political-economy-of-adult-learning-systems-9781474273664/

Diemer, A., Marquat, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Education au développement durable: Enjeux et controverses*. Brussels: De Boeck Supérieur.

Drudy, S.; Gunnerson, L. & Gilpin, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degree Programmes in Education*. Bilbao: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Deusto. http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/publications/269-reference-points-for-the-design-and-delivery-of-degree-programmes-in-education.html

Elliott, J. (2019). What is Lesson Study? *European Journal of Education, 54*(2), 175–188.

https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12339

Easterly, W. (2006). *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*. New York: Penguin Books.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fiore, B. & Poliandri, D. (2020). The Programme for International Student Assessment and Google: An Analysis of Online News in Italy. *European Journal of Education 55*(3), 428–40.

Gentles, C. et al. (2016). *ICET 2016 60th WORLD ASSEMBLY Teachers for a Better World: Creating Conditions for Quality Education*. School of Education Faculty of Humanities and Education The University of the West Indies.
https://www.icet4u.org/docs/Jamaica_2016.pdf

Green, A., Janmaat, J. G. and Han, C. (2009). *Regimes of Social Cohesion*. Centre for Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies and Societies. http://www.llakes.org.uk

Hall, S. (2006). The West and The Rest: Discourse and Power. In *Indigenous Experience: Global Perspectives* (pp. 165–173). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Holland, D., & Lave, J. (2019). Social Practice Theory and the Historical Production of Persons. In A. Edwards, M. Fleer, & L. Bøttcher (Eds.), *Cultural-Historical Approaches to Studying Learning and Development: Societal, Institutional and Personal Perspectives* (pp. 235–248). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6826-4_15

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Howard, T. C., & Navarro, O. (2016). Critical Race Theory 20 Years Later: Where Do We Go From Here? *Urban Education, 51*(3), 253–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915622541

Kim, J. (2020). Lifelong Learning for (Re)Making Future Citizens through South Korean Curriculum Reforms and OECD PISA. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 41*(4), 623–37.

Kirwan, L. (2015). Mathematics Curriculum in Ireland: The Influence of PISA on the Development of Project Maths. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 8*(2), 317–32.

Lokhoff, J. et al. (Eds.). (2010). *A Tuning Guide to Formulating Degree Programme Profiles, Including Programme Competences and Programme Learning Outcomes*. Universidad de Deusto. http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/publications.html

Martens, K. (2001). Non-governmental organisations as corporatist mediator? An analysis of NGOs in the UNESCO system. *Global Society, 15*(4), 387–404.

M'Bokolo, E. (2000). *Colonisation, décolonisation, postcolonialisme*. Mission 2000 en France. https://www.canal-u.tv/video/universite_de_tous_les_savoirs/colonisation_decolonisation_postcolonialisme.1160

Misiaszek, G. W. (2015). Ecopedagogy and Citizenship in the Age of Globalisation: Connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the planet. *European Journal of Education, 50*(3), 280–292. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12138

Mullis, I, Martin, M., Foy, P & Hooper, M. (2016). *TIMSS 2015: International Results in Mathematics*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement & Boston College. http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2015/international-results/wp-content/uploads/filebase/full%20pdfs/T15-International-Results-in-Mathematics.pdf

Nakayasu, C. (2016). School Curriculum in Japan. *The Curriculum Journal, 27*(1), 134–50.

Nuffic. (2015). *Education system Japan*. The Dutch organisation for internationalisation in education. https://www.nuffic.nl/en/subjects/education-and-diplomas-japan/

ODIHR (Ed.). (2012). *Guidelines on human rights education for secondary school systems*. OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

OECD. (2016a). *PISA 2015 Results (Volume I): Excellence and Equity in Education*. PISA, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264266490-en

OECD. (2016b). *PISA FAQ - OECD*. https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisafaq.htm

OECD. (2018a). *Education at a Glance 2018*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved 06/2020 from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en

OECD. (2018b). *Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world: The OECD PISA global competence framework*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Retrieved online 06/2020 from http://www.oecd.org/pisa/Preparing-youth-inclusive-sustainable-world.pdf

OECD. (2019a). *OECD Data* (p. Secondary graduation rates). Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. data.oecd.org

OECD. (2019b). *TALIS 2018 Data*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Retrieved 08/2019 from http://www.oecd.org/education/talis/talis-2018-data.htm

Rose, P. (2006). From the Washington to the Post-Washington Consensus: The Influence of International Agendas on Education Policy and Practice in Malawi. In *Education, Globalization & Social Change* (pp. 1016–1028). Oxford University Press.

Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., & Shultz, L. (2018). *Global Citizenship Education: A Critical Introduction to Key Concepts and Debates*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Sen, A. (2006). Poverty as Capability Deprivation. In *Education, Globalization and Social Change* (pp. 949–965). Oxford University Press.

Shah, P. (2015). Spaces to Speak: Photovoice and the Reimagination of Girls' Education in India. *Comparative Education Review, 59*(1), 50–74. https://doi.org/10.1086/678699

Stromquist, N. P. (2015). Women's Empowerment and Education: Linking knowledge to transformative action. *European Journal of Education, 50*(3), 307–324. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12137

Stromquist, N. P. (2006). Gender, education and the possibility of transformative knowledge. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 36*(2), 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920600741131

Torres, C. A., & Noguera, P. (2008). *Social Justice Education for Teachers*. Sense Publishers.

Torres, C. A. (2009). *Globalizations and education: Collected essays on class, race, gender, and the state*. Teachers College.

UIS (2012). *International Standard Classification of education, ISCED 2011*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf

UIS (2020a). *Data for the Sustainable Development Goals*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Retrieved online 2/2020 from http://uis.unesco.org

UIS (2020b). *World Inequality Database on Education* (WIDE). Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

UNESCO (1995). *Decisions adopted by the Executive Board at its 146th session*. United Nations. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000100560?posInSet=286&queryId=3b827dfa-262b-47e7-a290-40acfb802141

UNESCO. (2015). *Education 2030 Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action: Towards Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Lifelong Learning for All*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2019). *World Inequality Database on Education*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Data retrieved 08/2019 from https://unesco-wide-production.herokuapp.com

UNESCO (2020). *What is global citizenship education?* https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced/definition

United Nations (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. United Nations. http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf

Walji, P. (2020). The Teacher Preparation Programme – Cultivating IB Leader-Educators. *The Agha Khan Academies*. https://www.agakhanacademies.org/general/teacher-preparation-programme-—-cultivating-ib-leader-educators

Welner, K. (2017). *Might the New Gates Education Initiative Close Opportunity Gaps?* National Education Policy Center, University of Colorado Boulder. https://scholar.colorado.edu/concern/defaults/4q77fs11s

Wiksten, S. (2018). *Teacher Training in Finland: A Case Study*. [Ph.D. dissertation] University of California, Los Angeles. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1kk7c3bz

Wiksten, S., & Green, C. (2020). *Secondary Analysis of Findings from TALIS 2018: A Comparison of Expectations to Teachers' Role in Advancing Society and Equity in Finland, Japan, and the United States*. AERA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA. http://tinyurl.com/t33lj92

World Bank. (2019a). *Human Capital Index Rankings by Country*. World Bank. https://databank.worldbank.org/data/download/hci/HCI_2pager_DNK.pdf

World Bank. (2019b). *Gini index*. [World Bank estimate]. Retrieved from https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI

World Bank. (2020). *Gini index*. [World Bank estimate]. Retrieved from https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?locations=DE-FI-JP-DK-US

Appendix 1.

Curriculum for GCED teachers, educators, organizers and facilitators		
Purpose	To enable teachers and facilitators (1) to **respond to student GCED learning needs in locally meaningful ways,** (2) to work with existing resources, and (3) to be able to provide youth and adults opportunities to engage, ask questions and be heard.	
Characteristic	**Flexible.** This guideline for training teachers and educators for GCED education and learning can be used as a guideline for full-time studies or part-time studies in non-formal, informal or formal programs. The curriculum can be adapted for an introduction course, for a specialization of several courses or as elective or required part of already existing teacher education programmes.	
Education style	**Student centred learning,** including individual assignments and interactions in small and large groups. Instruction is structured so that **active student participation is supported**, encouraged and student participation is provided time and space within the framework of instruction. **Instruction models a variety of teaching and learning practices**. For example, students are provided models for (1) how to facilitate and support thematic discussions in small and large groups, (2) exercises for practicing articulation, narration, writing and discussion that connects to lived experiences of students, (3) exercises that model individual as well as collaborative learning and team learning. The course/program provides students with opportunities to **practice taking on the role of teacher/educator/facilitator,** for example, in the form of short teaching sessions followed by peer feedback.	
Generic Competences	**Knowledge**	Knowledge and understanding of principles and regulations that govern citizenship. Knowledge and understanding of social positionality, culture, economy and the environment locally, nationally, regionally and globally. Knowledge about **youth and adult learning theories** and research in youth and adult learning. Knowledge about power-resource relationships, environmental and societal change, locally, nationally, regionally and globally. Knowledge about social categories, social norms and social positionality. Knowledge and critical understanding of the self and the world. Knowledge of varieties of teaching-learning and assessment strategies and understanding of their theoretical bases.

Generic Competences	**Skills**	**Communication skills:** Linguistic skills. Ability to speak and write in the first language of the students, ability to speak and write in at least one additional language. Ability to communicate effectively to large and small groups of students. Advanced skills in reading and writing. Ability to use information technology. **Skills for autonomous and collaborative learning.** **Skills in research and inquiry.** Ability to discern among information sources, ability to identify learning needs in diverse groups of learners, skills in reflecting on the development of teaching practices. For example, how to maintain a teaching journal and how to develop a teaching portfolio. **Assessment.** Skills in formative and summative evaluation. Skills in creating an equal and **fair climate.** A micro context of learning that is conducive for learning for all learners regardless of their socio-cultural or economic background. **Teamwork**. Capacity for working as part of a team of teachers and for assuming responsibility for tasks. **Empathy,** skills for relating to other people's perspectives, beliefs and experiences.
	Attitudes	**Openness** and respect to cultural otherness and to other beliefs, world views and practices. **Civic-mindedness**. Belonging, caring and being aware of how one's actions impact a community of people that is larger than one's immediate group of reference. **Responsibility** in reflecting on one's own actions and holding oneself accountable for the outcomes of one's own actions. **Self-efficacy,** a positive belief in one's own ability to undertake the actions that are required to achieve particular goals. **Tolerance of ambiguity,** ability to evaluate positively and deal constructively with situations which are uncertain and subject to multiple conflicting interpretations.

Generic Competences	**Values**	Commitment to **health, well-being and safety**. Commitment to **environmental stewardship**. Commitment to learn from students and to learn about locally relevant ethical frameworks and **locally relevant environmental and civic issues**. Belief in that the potential to know about civic and environmental issues already exists in the local community and that the role of the educator is to respect, nurture and support the development of students and the development of a learning environment that is responsive to the learning needs of all students. Valuing human dignity, human rights and valuing diversity in societies locally, nationally, regionally and globally. Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law.
Subject Specific Competences	**Ability to reason about pedagogical decisions**, choices of instruction method, structure of assignments and approach to assessment used, by connecting to research-based theories of adult and youth learning. Ability to adjust and develop a locally relevant curriculum that responds in a flexible manner to the needs of diverse groups of learners. **Knowledge about Global Citizenship Education as a policy agenda and examples of how it can be applied in education.** Familiarity with key regulatory documents and research in the field of Global Citizenship Education and Sustainable Development, examples of GCED and sustainable development promotion in the context in which the teacher or educator will work, different perspectives on values and purposes pursued in GCED efforts and work on the SDG (global and local perspectives, tribal, modern and postmodern perspectives). **Knowledge about and experience with student evaluation and peer review practices.** Experience with practices for incorporating student and peer feedback into a continued development of teaching practices. **Lesson planning skills.** Ability to communicate learning goals and purpose, ability to structure instruction so that students are provided with opportunities to ask questions and contribute to group discussions, ability to structure collective efforts to carry out inquires on GCED and related themes and topics, ability to support students to develop skills in working as a team and for assuming responsibility for tasks.	

Learning Outcomes	**Ability to articulate and communicate the purpose and goals** of ALE GCED teaching and learning activities clearly and effectively to diverse groups of students. **Ability to respond to student learning needs** (linguistic, physical, cognitive development related, social, emotional, cultural and faith related). **Ability to adjust ALE GCED curricula** and teaching learning materials for local context, to plan lessons, to evaluate students, to reflect on pedagogical choices and to develop a teaching portfolio. **Ability to work together** with other teachers for developing teaching materials, addressing student learning needs and contributing to the development of a fair, supporting and positive learning environment for all. **Ability to pursue continued learning opportunities** of relevance for continued professional development as ALE GCED teachers and educators.

Source: Table constructed by Wiksten, S. 2019.